

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Alexandria Division**

ROSY GIRON DE REYES, *et al.*,

*Plaintiffs,*

vs.

WAPLES MOBILE HOME PARK  
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

Civ. No. 1:16-cv-00563 (LO/TCB)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO FILE DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

This matter comes before the Court under Local Civil Rule 5, and on the motion of Plaintiffs Rosy Giron De Reyes, Jose Dagoberto Reyes, Felix Alexis Bolanos, Ruth Rivas, Yovana Jaldin Solis, Esteban Ruben Moya Yrapura, Rosa Elena Amaya, and Herbert David Saravia Cruz ("Plaintiffs") to file under seal Exhibits 1, 2, 3, and 4 to Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion *in Limine*. The exhibits consist of documents designated confidential pursuant to the Protective Order (Dkt. 45).

Before this Court may seal documents, it must: "(1) provide public notice of the request to seal and allow interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object, (2) consider less drastic alternatives to sealing the documents, and (3) provide specific reasons and factual findings supporting its decision to seal the documents and for rejecting the alternatives." *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 282, 288 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) (internal citations omitted).

In compliance with Local Rule 5 and *Ashcraft*, the Court has provided public notice of this motion by posting an appropriate Notice on the public docket board:

“This document serves as notice to the public that Plaintiffs, by counsel, have moved the Court to seal from public disclosure certain exhibits to Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion *in Limine*. A brief description of the contents of the documents that Plaintiffs request to file under seal is as follows:

- Exhibit 1: Confidential excerpts from Defendants’ designated 30(b)(6) deposition.
- Exhibit 2: Confidential excerpts from the deposition transcript of Peter Williams.
- Exhibit 3: Confidential excerpts from the deposition transcript of Albert Dwoskin.
- Exhibit 4: Communications between the parties related to Plaintiff’s lease agreement which the parties have maintained as confidential.”

Based upon Plaintiffs’ filings, the Court **FINDS** that less drastic alternatives to sealing the Proposed Sealed Documents are not feasible. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the Proposed Sealed Document shall be maintained under seal by the Clerk, until otherwise directed. The Clerk is **REQUESTED** to send a copy of this Order to all counsel of record.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable L. O’Grady  
United States District Court for the  
Eastern District of Virginia